DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 450 CS 502 092

AUTHOR Blankenship, Jane
TITLE In the Presence of the Word: Rhetoric and Responsibility.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Speech Communication Association (Atlanta, Georgia, April 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; *Communication Skills; *Educational Needs; Higher Education; Language Skills; *Language Usage; *Public Speaking; *Rhetoric; *Speech Communication; Values

ABSTRACT

One of the major problems facing the profession of speech communication is the need for an increased concern with teaching the "basics" involved in listening carefully and speaking clearly and with vigor. Speech communication educators must take great care in defining the basics of discourse; they should teach the mechanics of grammar and syntax in context, teach a concern for the primacy of substance and ideas, and stress the need for clarity and precision of language. A second problem is the need to demonstrate a concern for clarity and precision in public discourse. Two current abuses of the public language are "doublespeak," an inaccurate use of language, and "psychobabble," an imprecise use of terms denoting psychological states. A third major problem is the need for an increased concern with the value-laden aspects of discourse. Many public figures have spoken with intensity and direction in confronting value-laden choices, among them Adlai Stevenson, Margaret Chase Smith, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Martin Luther King. (GW) *

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane Blankenship

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED154450

# IN THE PRESENCE OF THE WORD: RHETORIC AND RESPONSIBILITY

Jane Blankenship

Southern Speech Communication Association Convention

Atlanta, April 7, 1978

Thank you. I am delighted to join you today--first, because it allows me, formally, to bring you greetings from the Speech Communication Association and, secondly, because as some of you may know, I was born into a family of Virginians and Kentuckians and thus have had an early and sustained glimpse of "Southern Hospitality." And despite occasional mutterings at family reunions about "the one who went up North," at least at last glance they had not yet read me completely out of the family tree. Moreover, my coming to Atlanta has been taken as a hopeful sign by those who remain convinced that redemption is still possible--even for a sometime New Englander!

Atlanta is one of the first stops on the "grand tour" of speechifying and listening associated with my SCA office. Two weeks ago I spoke at the Eastern meetings where my subject was "Acknowledging Problems and Implementing Solutions." And next week I fly to Chicago to address the Central meetings on their overarching convention theme, "Practical Perspectives on Human Communication." I relate that bit of travelog simply to indicate that I <u>have been</u> and will <u>be</u> spending a good deal of time this early Spring examining, in greater depth than I have ever done, the most persistently pressing problems those of us in speech communication must face up to with vigor, with dispatch and with

CS502092

no small amount of vision.

Our list of increasingly pressing "practical" topics is long indeed. Such a list would include:

-- continued budget restraints and their implications;

-- serious questions raised by administrators about the uniqueness of speech communication and its particular place in the curriculum;

-- our discipline's tendency to thirst after what G. P. Mohrmann has aptly called, "novelty with a vengeance."[1] On occasion it seems as if we share with Browning's "Last Duchess," a propensity to like whate'er we look on, and our looks go everywhere!

And no such list would be complete without mentioning the need to educate our students with a serious and immediate concern for their employability.

But, also, on any such agenda is the problem at least hinted at by the title of my remarks today, "The Presence of the Word: Rhetoric and Responsibility." So general a title leaves one considerable latitude. And I do intend to cut a very large swathe, indeed. I do so in the self-justificatory sense that so complex and central a problem calls for no less. And, if nothing else, I do want to persuade you that the problem I discuss today is complex and central to our well being as a discipline and as a profession. The problem may be summarized thusly: Today in our society many (including an alarming number in speech communication) have forgotten what it means to acknowledge that we do, indeed, live "in the presence of the word." No, I am not, here, going to talk about Kenneth Burke's Rhetoric of Religion[2] or even Father

Ong's extraordinary book from which I've borrowed the title of these remarks.[3] But, today I propose that we put on our agenda of pressing critical problems, our repeated embarrassment over, or, at least inattention to--the presence of the word. I will argue, that by our "embarrassment" or "inattention", we have helped impoverish our nation's rhetoric and abdicated much of our responsibility for sustaining its vigor. Briefly, I want to outline several aspects of that "forgetfulness" and suggest that to our profession's agenda of pressing concerns we add these three: an increased concern with the "basics" and, in fact, greater care in defining "basic"; an increased concern for the sad state of our public language; and an increased concern with the value-laden aspects of discourse. These three concerns, as one may readily see, are, in practice, inextricably bound up with one another.

As United States Commissioner of Education, Ernest Boyer, observed at the last SCA convention, we need to pay considerable attention to helping "our students become more sophisticated themselves as message senders and receivers."[4] As he pointed out, of course, we need to help students learn "how to sort out and evaluate the messages they receive." But, ". . . the time has come to emphasize not only the receiving of messages. We must focus on the sending of messages as well. For no matter how much we rejoice in the new communication. . . one of the unhappy by-products of our current culture is the trend toward increased passivity. We are soaking up the messages of others and becoming less effective in formulating messages of our own." "It's time," he concluded, "for all of us to focus on clear and precise communication. It's time to teach children not only how

to read and to look but to write and to speak."

There was considerable merit in the National Council of Teachers of English convention theme in 1977, "Forward to the Basics." I don't wish to be ungracious to my close colleagues in English departments, but it took a lot of prodding from Newsweek, the front page of the New York Times and a nation of irate parents to move them to once again fully recognize their responsibility for teaching people to write.

I like to think that, in our own discipline's continued search for "academic respectability" along with our much needed theory-building and along with our serious research which is still needed on almost every key question in speech communication--that along with these tasks we also take time to teach our students, and, in fact, our communities, to speak and listen more effectively. And that we do not have to undergo the 20 years or so of not-so-benign neglect of the basics from which English departments are just emerging. The times are too troubled and our expertise too valuable for us to relive that bit of history in our own discipline. I will state our obligation quite directly. If we do not take seriously our obligation to help teach people from pre-K to old age to listen carefully and speak clearly and with vigor, then we will have helped relegate them to the passivity and inarticulateness of those who have no effective voices in our society--and our society, if it survives such neglect, will surely be impoverished by their silence--or by their less than full effectiveness.

Coupled with my concern over whether we, too, are willing to "look forward to the basics," is my concern over some of the current definitions of "basic." I fear that we speech communication

educators may fall into our own verions of defining the "basics" as the "mechanics" of writing and speaking whether in dyadic, small group or one-to-group settings. With Daniel Shanahan, writing in Change magazine, I am concerned that: "The cries for a return to basics often exhibit a failure to understand communication skills for what they really are: tools for sharpening perception."[5]

Many voices, often from disparate sources, and out of different specific motives, point out what some of the basics of discourse really are:

1. learning to identify inferences and assumptions
2. learning to support a thesis or point of view adequately
3. learning about different kinds of arguments and their strengths and weaknesses
4. learning the several ways to define terms and the sense to define them
5. learning to organize materials into coherent patterns

I expect an awareness of such a definition of "basic" is what recently led Robert Lumiansky, President of the American Council of Learned Societies, to ask us to quit indulging "ourselves at this point with high-flown talk about 'reaffirming hunamistic value'...." "What we need first," he prescribes, "is effective attention devoted to the basic humanistic disciplines in our public education systems...." He lists three such disciplines, first among them "written and oral communication in the English language." I suspect Lumiansky is right in his observation that: "Unless we can raise the general level of ability substantially in these areas, we do not stand much chance of securing for the humanistics a greatly expanded

expanded role in our national life."[6] Our own discipline's Thomas Sloane well understood such a point of view when, at the 1976 SCA convention, he called for "a reassertion of pride in our work of teaching basic skills. Whether the basic skill is argumentatation, public speaking, or reading aloud, we offer an educational program not available in any other discipline, and the skills we have to teach are essential ones to all educational enterprises in a way mere 'service' courses are not."[7]

Again, it would to too bad if we allow ourselves to be sidetracked by many of the same "detours" taken by some of the most vocal friends of the back-to-basics movement in English. (And nobody knows more vividly how embarrassing one's "friends" can be than the director of a communication skills program, which purports to teach 4,200 first-year students, when one's friends defend the program, often on the wrong grounds!). For just as "basics" means something far more important than spelling, the semicolon, and rule 69B in The Essential Stylist, so they include more for us than pronunciation, establishing a feeling of togetherness, and eye contact 80% of the time.

Many thoughtful people realize that even these "mechanics" are in fact substantial. One may cite, for example, an expository writing teacher at Standord University quoted in the Chronicle of Higher Education: "The errors I see most of the time--dangling modifiers, overuse of the passive voice, and the failure to make the subject and the verb agree--are all indications of our uncertainty in point of view." Perhaps another way of saying this, the Stanford professor concludes, "is that I see in my students a lack of

directness in confronting their own experience."[8] Couple this kind of observation with those made in a 1974 national study of 9-year-olds, 13-year-olds, and 17-year-olds, which identified 3 main problems: (1) lack of organization, (2) poor transitions between sentences and (3) inability to improve writing through revision. It's not that the students were unwilling to revise but that they rarely made anything other than mechanical corrections and rarely made changes that improved organization.[9]

Now, if many in this room hold, as I suspect they do, that style is a revelation of epistemic stance, then surely such "mechanical" problems ought better to be viewed as <u>substantial</u> (and no <u>pun</u> is intended). In fact, <u>any</u> attempt to separate the "mechanics." of grammar and syntax from contect seems pedagogically misleading. As I have observed elsewhere, "Through lexical and syntactical choices the /speaker/ reveals his categorization and structuring of experience; style is inextricably associated with what the speaker says; it both shapes and is shaped by 'meaning.'"[10]

But the "mechanics" however profoundly approached are not the <u>only</u> basics. Surely among them is an overriding concern for the primacy of substance and ideas. Karl Wallace writing "On the Well-Being of the Profession," made this point crisply: "A communication in whatever medium, involves meaning, and the symbols used to convey meaning are not empty.... If the medium is that of speech and language, the utterance is always saying something. It has taken a long time for this to sink in. Rhetoricians in particular, and some teachers of English, know that they are dealing with something more than style and grammar. They are dealing with content, substance

and ideas that are communicated only through signs and symbols and that institute all aspects of the human beings experience and culture."[11]

Among the "basics" a central place must be left for clarity and precision of language. The frauds we suffer from hucksters and shysters of all varieties do indeed, as Donald Bryant has pointed out, derive much of their strength from the merely superficial familiarity [we have] with the "live use of language." Clearly I am not talking merely about who/that substitutions or even about noun/verb agreements (although, I do, in fact, in my secret grammatical heart, long for that too!). Our "language problems" are more "basic" than that. What is most basic about this "basic" is a deep awareness that language "is a system of imputation, by which values and percepts are first framed in the mind. . . ."[12] and that language "reveals every facet of the cognitive, conative, and affective aspects of personality."[13] We have, of course, known much of this long before Richard Weaver and Karl Wallace reminded us anew.

My second overriding concern this morning then, is that those of us in speech communication pay more attention to the "public language." Lest I be misunderstood on this point, let me make it abundantly clear what I am not talking about:

-- I am not talking about dialects or ideolects;

-- I am not bemoaning the contemporary, youthful verbal correlates of our 1950 sloppy joe sweaters, brown and white oxfords and crinoline petticoats;

-- In fact, I am not even bemoaning professional "jargon."

These are surely inevitable and often necessary to allow us to "say" new things and to express our sense of particular or special communities. In our own several "special" or "particular" communities, we, like James Joyce, "methodically set out to produce a private

language, a language that is, as far as possible, the sheer replica of in-turning engrossments" and devote those parts of our lives "to the study of its internalities."[14] But most of us do not live solely in special communities and in "internalities" and we also seek after, what Burke calls, "consubstantiality" with larger publics and, thereby, we also speak the "public language."[15] Thus, what I am concerned about is the public language (in the broadest possible definition of that conception).

Again, lest I be misunderstood, let me approach this point by telling you what I do not mean to imply:

-- I do not secretly long for a French Academy to provide us with a "purified dictionary." Thankfully language and language users will not be straitjacketed by such strictures;

-- I do not secretly long to banish ambiguity from our linguistic map. I, too, know that ambiguity, especially when systematically exercised as Kenneth Burke sometimes urges, is a rich source of new meanings or, perhaps still more accurately, new ways of looking at things;

-- I do not secretly long to reduce the marvels of Gerard Manley Hopkins or Dylan Thomas to Basic English;

-- And, yes, I know that language is ever richly diverse and ever changing;

-- And, yes, I even know that meaning is "negotiated" between speaker and listener.

But none of this precludes a concern for clarity and precision in public discourse. For no matter how much some speakers try to

make is so, a rose is not a "rose" by any other name especially when it is called a "flower" (which is more general) or a "tulip" (which is simply inaccurate).

Today I think there are two major abuses of the public language that are particularly dangerous: (a) Doublespeak and (b) Psychobabble. I am concerned about Doublespeak, whether in government or educational circles, because it is inaccurate--it encourages us to call a "rose" a "tulip," sometimes with quite deadly consequences. It allows us to live in a world of "clean bombs" (as in anything other than the abstract, people are not still killed by them) and in a world where cheating is called "collaborative study" (as if all "collaborative study" were also cheating).

While Psychobabble may on the surface seem less harmful and more humorous, I suspect it is not. For often Psychobabble calls "flowers" what should be called "tulips" and "roses." Psychobabble is a world in which "uptight" and "hangup" may indicate anything from a mild uneasiness to clinical depression. R. D. Rosen in the book Fast Talk and Quick Cure in the Era of Feeling puts the matter more crisply. Psychobabble is, says Rosen, a jargon which "seems to free float in an all-purpose linguistic atmosphere, a set of repetitive verbal formalities that kills off the very spontaneity, candor, and understanding it pretends to promote. It's an idiom that reduces psychological insight to a collection of standardized observations, that provides a frozen lexicon to deal with an infinite variety of problems."[16] In short, if Doublespeak lies directly, Psychobabble lies indirectly by reducing necessary variety to sameness. If our language use is the manifestation of what we see and how we conceive of the re-

lationships between the things we see," if our language use reflects our interpretation of reality," then one may pause to ask: What does psychobabble tell us about that "reality?"[17]

As Bess Sondel reminds us, "We are born into an environment of words just as surely as we are born into an environment of weather."[18] I am here suggesting that we place our public language on our broader list of "environmental concerns."

But I do not think it enough for us to show an increased concern with the "basics" and with the precaricus state of our public language; I think we must also show an increased concern with the value-laden aspects of discourse. Richard Ohmann's observation makes abundant good sense: rhetorical practice "grows out of deep intellectual and moral habits." I do not know if I would go so far as Barzun that "the state of the [language] is in fact the index to our control over destiny" but I do agree with him that if language reveals personal psychoses, it may well also reveal national psychoses. I do agree with James Andrews that "a choice of words is a choice of worlds."[19]

In a paper "The Mind's Eye: Creating in Language," Walker Gibson reminded us that "It is one of the many delights of the English Language that the word eye (e-y-e) is a homonym of the first person singular pronoun. Whatever school of perception theory pleasures you, all agree that the interaction between the physical organ [eye] and the person doing the perceiving [I] is close, complex and absolutely inescapable. That interaction is enshrined in the English Language. . . ."[20] While I do not want to engage in untoward one-upsmanship with my Bartlett Hall colleague in Amherst, there is one other "close, complex and

absolutely inescapable" link in the I-Eye connection. One might add another Aye--spelled A-Y-E.[21]

This last member of that awesome triumverate serves to remind us that "the 'stuff' of speeches springs from the essential character of the speaking act, choice-making."

In an article in the Center Magazine entitled "The Demise of Dialogue," Milton Mayer suggests that the "characteristic temper of the age is frenzy."[24] A writer in The New York Times has called ours a "decade of distraction."[25] Surely if nothing else, we can agree that we are subject to what Kai Erikson calls "sensory overload." And, as he describes it: "One result of all this is apt to be a flattening of affect, a sheer anesthetization of the moral and cognitive senses, as if one were suffering from a kind of psychological concussion." He continues: ". . . human reactions to the age we are entering are likely to include a sense of cultural disorientation, a feeling of powerlessness, a dulled apathy, and a generalized fear about the condition of the universe. "These, of course," he adds, "are among the classic symptoms of trauma. . . ."[26]

I would not be so bold as to suggest that these attributes describe to some extent the participants in that recent national "trauma" called Watergate. But one might pause at least a moment to listen to John Ehrlichman: "I lived fifty years of my life without ever really coming to grips with the very basic question of what is and what is not important to me, what is and is not right and wrong, what is and what is not valuable and worthwhile. . ."[27] Perhaps such a massive and tragic debacle as Ehrlichman and associates engaged in prompted Boyer and Kaplan, in part, to suggest: ". . . the study of the future should involve . . . acts inherent in all values, the exposure of hidden assumptions, and the confronting of value-laden choices."[28]

"The valuable," the "worthwhile," and the choice-making entailed in those labellings -- luckily, we in speech communication have a very long tradition of looking at people who do confront in

their moments of decision "value-laden choices," and, not so coincidentally, who state those choices in language appropriate to their enacting. "It is," as Kenneth Burke has suggested, "the moral impulse that motivates perception, giving it both intensity and direction, suggesting what to look for and what to look out for."[29] Listen for a moment to those who have spoken with intensity and direction, suggesting what to look for and what to look out for:

-- Archibald Cox, on stage, pleading with Harvard students not to drive a speaker of the political Right from the stage. If we still any voice, he reminded them, then "Liberty will have died a little."

-- Adlai Stevenson, in his speeches on the relevance of moral principle to politics, reminding his allies "Better to lose an election than to misgovern the people."

-- Margaret Chase Smith, rising in the United States Senate chamber in those dark McCarthy days, and announcing her "Declaration of Conscience."

--

-- Lord Chatham, often ailing and after nearly 10 years defending the rights of the American colonists, urging the immediate removal of troops from the homes of Boston: "When I urge this measure of recalling the troops from Boston, I urge it on this pressing principle, that it is necessarily preparatory to the restoration of your peace and the establishment of your prosperity. [I]f the ministers thus persevere in misadvising the King, I will not say that they can alientate the affections of his subjects from his crown, but I will affirm <u>that they will make the crown not worth his wearing</u>. I will pronounce <u>that the Kindgom is undone</u>."

-- Barbara Jordan, recalling before the Democratic National Convention: "Many are distrustful of their leaders, and believe that their voices are never heard. Many seek only to satisfy their private. . . wants. To satisfy <u>private</u> interests. But this is the great danger America faces. That we will. . . become. . . a collection of <u>interest</u> groups: city

against suburb, region against region, individual against individual. Each seeking to satisfy private wants. If <u>that</u> happens, who then will speak for America? Who then will speak for the <u>common</u> good?

-- Eleanor Roosevelt, unafraid to be thought "sentimental," reminding us by her quiet example, that it is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness.

-- Or, Martin Luther King, discoursing, often at great personal peril, on "Love, Law and Civil Disobedience," urging us never to forget that means are ends <u>in process</u>.

We do not, in fact have to look outside of our profession for example of extraordinary eloquence. Recall:

-- Wayland Maxfield Parrish reminding us, "Not failure but low aim is crime."

-- Marie Nichols after providing us with an eloquent glimpse of what may happen when [we], like Odysseus, set out for Ithaka. . . ," closing with these lines from the Greek poet C. P. Cavafy:

When you set out for Ithaka
pray that your road's a long one,
full of adventure, full of discovery.
. . . . . .
Keep Ithaka always in mind.
Arriving there is what you're destined for.
But don't hurry the journey at all.
Better if it goes on for years

so you're old by the time you reach the island,
wealthy with all you've gained on the way,
not expecting Ithaka to make you rich.
Ithaka gave you the marvelous journey.
Without her you wouldn't have set out.[31]

-- Your (our) own Waldo Braden in asking: What shall we do about the demands for snake oil?" Warned communication educators against taking the shortcuts of contemporary sophistry. Such "short cuts," he reminded us, do not go very far in helping us solve the problems of urban re-development. They "fail to produce good will..., fail to lessen conflict and fail to give hope to the cynical, the bitter, the distressed, the forlorn, and the forgotten. For these, Professor Braden remind, "there <u>are</u> no short cuts, no tricks."

Nor would I restrict such glimpses of choice-making to the sole paradigm of the speech text but would urge also that we continue to enlarge our studies of what Herbert Simons calls "the materials of a post Guttenberg, post xerox, post RCA, post IBM society.[33] For, in a multitude of contexts, Herbert Wichelns was surely correct in saying that "considerable light goes up on human nature when you contemplate it in its moments of decision"--whether those decisions are made by persons in the historical past or present; whether those persons are functioning in dyadic, small group, or large group settings; whether they are communicating in face-to-face settings or those mediated by film, TV or "literary texts."

In sum,

-- to train young men and women to speak with clarity and substance;

-- to teach people that language is using us while we are using it;

-- to put before young women and men (and thereby to remind ourselves) what others, in their moments of decision, in their giving of "good reasons," have said--often with courage and not infrequently with the elegance that comes of clear vision and a sympathetic heart;

-- in short, without cynicism and embarrassment to remind our students of their humanity and therein to find our own. . . .

-- that we compose(put together) accurately (from ad cura, with care)--that we put together our words and our world with care.

FOOTNOTES

[1] G. P. Mohrmann, "A Canon of Rhetorical Works: A Proposal," on the program Public Address: Is There A Center that Holds? at the 1977 SCA Convention.

[2] Kenneth Burke, The Rhetoric of Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961).

[3] Walter J. Ong, The Presence of the Word (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967).

[4] Ernest Boyer, "Keynote Address" at the 1977 SCA Convention.

[5] Daniel Shanahan, "Why Johnny Can't Think," Change

[6] Robert Lumiansky as cited in "The Discomfited Humanities," Change (March, 1978), pp. 10-11.

[7] Thomas O. Sloane, "Speech as on Interdisciplinary Enterprise." A paper presented at the 1976 SCA Convention.

[8] From "Notes on ... Writing," Chronicle of Higher Education (Feb., 13, 1978), p. 2.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Jane Blankenship, "The Influence of Mode, Sub-Mode, and Speaker Predilection on Style," Speech Monographs (June, 1974), p. 88.

[11] Karl Wallace, "On the Well-Being of the Profession," Spectra (June, 1972), p. 4. See also "The Primary of Substance and Ideas in the Teaching of Practical Discourse," English Journal (Jan., 1964), pp. 1-9.

[12] Richard Weaver, "Language is Sermonic," as reprinted in Richard L. Johannesen, ed., Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings (N.Y.: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1971), p.177. This essay was delivered first as a speech at the University of Oklahoma in 1962.

[13] Karl R. Wallace, Understanding Discourse (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1970), p. 13.

[14] Kenneth Burke, Philosophy of Literary Form, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), p. 44. First published, 1941.

[15] Kenneth Burke, Rhetoric of Motives (N.Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 21.

[16] R. D. Rosen as cited in Christopher Reed, "Psychobabble: The Newspeak of Our Age," The /Manchester/ Guardian (Jan., 22, 1978), p 19.

[17] Jane Blankenship, A Sense of Style (Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1968), p.

[18] Bess Sondel, The Humanity of Words (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1958), p. 20.

[19] James Andrews, A Choice of Words: The Practice and Criticism of Public Discourse (N.Y.: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973).

[20] Walker Gibson, "In the Mind's Eye: Creating in Language," a paper delivered as part of the Chancellor's Lecture Series, 1976-77, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

[21] "I, Eye, Ay--Emerson's Early Essay on 'Nature': Thoughts on the Machinery of Transcendence," The Sewanee Review (Fall, 1966), pp. 875-895.

[22] Vital Speeches. (Sept., 1, 1976), p. 682.

[23] Vital Speeches (March 1, 1977), p. 294.

[24] Milton Mayer, "Demise of Dialogue," Center Magazine (Jan/Feb., 1977), p. 12.

[25] New York Times (August 24, 1977), p. 61.

[26] Kai Erickson, "Living in a World without Stable Points of Reference," World Issues: Center for Study of Democratic Institutions (Dec., 76/Jan., 1977), p. 14.

[27] John Erlichman as quoted in the Mayer article, p. 15.

[28] Ernest L. Boyer & Martin Kaplan, "Educating for Survival: A Call for a Core Curriculum," Change (March, 1977), p. 28.

[29] Kenneth Burke, Philosophy of Literary Form, p. 164.

[30] "Ithaka," The Poems of C. P. Cavafy, trans. John Mavrogordata (N.Y.: Grove Press, 1952), pp. 32-33 as cited in Marie Nichols, "When You Set Out for Ithaka...," "Keynote Address" at the Central States Speech Association Convention, 1977. Reprinted in the Central States Speech Journal (Fall, 1977).

[31] Waldo Braden, "The Available Means of Persuasion: What Shall We Do about the Demand for Snake Oil?" in J. Jeffrey Auer, ed., The Rhetoric of our Times (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969), pp. 181, 184. Underlining mine.